

Customer No.: 31561  
Application No.: 10/604,629  
Docket No.: 10875-US-PA

**REMARKS**

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed on November 16, 2005. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims 1-18 as amended are respectfully requested.

**Present Status of the Application**

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 2, 11, 18 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tanada et al., US Patent 6,909,409. Claims 3-10 and 12-17 allowable subject matter but objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

In response to the rejection of claims 1, 2, 11, 18 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tanada et al., US Patent 6,909,409, Applicant hereby otherwise traverses this rejection. As such, Applicant submits that claims 1 and 11 are now in condition for allowance.

With respect to claim 1, as originally filed, recites:

Claim 1 (original) An integrated driver device frame of a liquid crystal display panel, comprising:  
a plurality of driver units, wherein each driver unit has a corresponding driver unit width and drives a corresponding driving line, respectively; and  
a plurality of pixels, wherein each pixel is coupled to one of the driving lines;  
wherein a relationship between the driver unit width and the interval of two neighboring pixels is that, the driver unit width is larger than the interval of two neighboring pixels and less than two times of the interval of two neighboring pixels.

Page 2

Customer No.: 31561  
Application No.: 10/604,629  
Docket No.: 10875-US-PA

Applicant submits that such an integrated driver device frame as set forth in claim 1 is neither taught, disclosed, nor suggested by Tanada '409 or any of the other cited references, taken alone or in combination.

The Examiner alleged that in FIG. 2B, Tanada '409 shows all elements required by the present invention as set forth in claim 1. However, in FIG. 2B, Tanada '409 fails to disclose, teach or suggest a **relationship between the driver unit width and the interval of two neighboring pixels is that, the driver unit width is larger than the interval of two neighboring pixels and less than two times of the interval of two neighboring pixels** that is required for the integrated driver device frame as set forth in claim 1 (emphasis added). Therefore, claim 1 as originally filed should not be considered as being anticipated by Tanada '409 or any of the other cited references, taken alone or in combination.

Tanada '409 teaches, as cited by the Examiner, a plurality of source signal lines (alleged as driver units by the Examiner), and a plurality of pixels, each two adjacent pixels sharing correspondingly sharing a source signal line (Column 8, lines 1-10). However, Tanada '409 fails to disclose, teach or suggest an above-described relationship between the driver unit width and the interval of two neighboring (adjacent) pixels that is required for the integrated driver device frame as set forth in claim 1. On the contrary, Tanada '409 teaches: "the width denoted by D2 (driving unit width) in FIG. 2B is the width for placing one stage of circuits of the source signal line (driving unit) side driver circuit. When the pixel pitch in FIG. 2B is equal to the pixel pitch

Customer No.: 31561  
Application No.: 10/604,629  
Docket No.: 10875-US-PA

in FIG. 2A, the width D2 is twice the width D1 (FIGS. 1A and 1B, column 8, lines 10-16) (emphasis added).

The exact pixel pitch (the interval of two neighboring pixels) is not expressly defined in the specification of Tanada '409, while FIG. 2B illustrates that the width D2 (the driver unit width) is equal to two times of the pixel pitch (interval of two neighboring pixels). Further, Applicants submit that FIG. 2B is based on a foundation of "each two adjacent pixels sharing correspondingly sharing a source signal line (Column 8, lines 1-10)" that is contradicted to "each pixel is coupled to one of the driving lines" and "each driver unit ... drives a corresponding driving line", which are required by the present integrated driver device frame as set forth in claim 1 (emphasis added).

In a similar manner, claim 11, recites:

Claim 11 (original) An integrated driver device frame of a liquid crystal display panel, comprising:  
a plurality of driver units, wherein each driver unit has a corresponding driver unit width and drives a corresponding driving line, respectively; and  
a plurality of pixels, wherein each pixel is coupled to one of the driving lines; wherein the plurality of driver units are arranged with two staggered rows, and one of the driver units in a row is neighboring to at least one of the driver units in another row.

Customer No.: 31561  
Application No.: 10/604,629  
Docket No.: 10875-US-PA

Similarly, Applicant submits that such an integrated driver device frame as set forth in claim 1 is neither taught, disclosed, nor suggested by Tanada '409 or any of the other cited references, taken alone or in combination.

Similar reasons are there making the present integrated driver device frame as set forth in claim 11 distinct from Tanada '409. In addition, as shown in FIG. 2B, Tanada '409 discloses a plurality of driver units arranged in a single row (FIG. 2B) rather than with two staggered rows that is required by the present integrated driver device frame as set forth in claim 11 (emphasis added).

Accordingly, claims 1, 11 are submitted to be novel, unobvious, and patentable over Tanada '409, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-10 depend from claim 1, and therefore should also be allowable.

Claims 12-18 depend from claim 11, and therefore should also be allowable.

Customer No.: 31561  
Application No.: 10/604,629  
Docket No.: 10875-US-PA

### CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that the pending claims 1-18 are in proper condition for allowance and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Date : *February 15, 2006*

Respectfully submitted,

*Belinda Lee*  
Belinda Lee

Registration No.: 46,863

Jiang Chyun Intellectual Property Office  
7<sup>th</sup> Floor-1, No. 100  
Roosevelt Road, Section 2  
Taipei, 100  
Taiwan  
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800  
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233  
Email: [belinda@jicpgroup.com.tw](mailto:belinda@jicpgroup.com.tw)  
[Usa@jicpgroup.com.tw](mailto:Usa@jicpgroup.com.tw)